Fostering A Culture of Academic Integrity at Middlebury

Honor Code Review 2023-2024

Interim Report

May 2024

Submitted by the 2023-2024 Honor Code Review Committee

Michelle Audette, Assistant Director for Community Standards
Jane Chaplin, James I. Armstrong Professor of Classics
Fanta Diop ‘25, SGA Appointee
Brian Lind, Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs
Jonathan Miller-Lane, Associate Professor of Education
Obie Porteous, Associate Professor of Economics
Emily Wight ‘24, Judicial Board student chair

2023 - 2024 Honor Code Review Committee Report

Committee Charge

The constitution of the Middlebury College Honor Code includes the following requirement in *Article IV. Amendment Procedures and Review Committee*:

> b. At least every fourth year, a committee consisting of two faculty members, two students (one of whom will be the current co-chair of the Academic Judicial Board), and a member from the Dean of the College Office shall examine the honor system and its operation and make any appropriate recommendations for revision to the faculty and the Community Council. Faculty members will be selected by the Faculty Council, the second student member by the Student Government Association, and the dean by the Dean of the College or his/her designate.

The 2016-17 academic year was the last Honor Code Review process. The 2020 Covid pandemic disrupted the four-year interval sequence and this year marks the reintroduction of that cycle.

Committee Membership

As part of the 2016-17 review, the Academic Integrity Committee was formed and thus the appointees for that committee were drafted to serve as the faculty members of the Honor Code Review Committee. The full committee for 2023-24 is, as follows:

- Michelle Audette, Assistant Director for Community Standards
- Jane Chaplin, James I. Armstrong Professor of Classics
- Fanta Diop ‘25, SGA Appointee
- Brian Lind, Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs
- Jonathan Miller-Lane, Associate Professor of Education
- Obie Porteous, Associate Professor of Economics
- Emily Wight ‘24, Judicial Board student chair

Committee Process Overview

The Honor Code Review Committee (HCRC) began meeting bi-weekly in September of 2023 to carry out the review process. Per the handbook, the charge is vague and allows the committee to determine the scope of depth to engage in review.

Given the context of recent Zeitgeist surveys conducted by *The Middlebury Campus*, a post-pandemic academic landscape, and general concern around the topic of academic integrity, the HCRC decided that now is the time to ask some big questions regarding the state of academic integrity at Middlebury, our Honor Code, whether the Honor Code still serves our community, and what, if any, changes should be made.

Faculty Engagement

To take on such broad and existential questions the faculty members of the HCRC hosted three open meetings with faculty on December 11, 2023 and January 17 and 25, 2024, as well as a meeting with the faculty of the Economics Department on January 19, 2024. In addition, many faculty sent emails to committee members offering further input to the process. We have received faculty input representing a broad array of disciplines including Biochemistry, Biology, Chemistry, Chinese, Classics, Computer Science, Economics, Education Studies, English, History, Mathematics, Neuroscience, Political Science, Psychology, Writing and Rhetoric, and others. Staff from the Office Of Digital Learning and Inquiry (DLINQ) also attended the faculty open meetings and provided crucial input. The committee also met with staff from the Disability Resource Center, members of the Health Professions Office, the Dean of the First-Year Experience, the First Year Seminar Director, and Provost Michelle McCauley to discuss particular issues.

Student Engagement

During spring semester 2024, the committee developed an online survey for students and with the approval of the Student Government Association that online survey was sent to all Middlbeury undergraduate students in March, 2024. We received 53 responses. The committee also attended a meeting sponsored by the Student Government Association on April 11, 2024 to receive in person feedback. The April meeting provided an opportunity to engage in deeper discussion around the issue of fostering a culture of academic integrity at Middlebury and the current student ‘take’ on the meaning and importance of an Honor Code.

Findings

Five themes emerged from our discussions with students, staff and faculty. Each theme is stated below and discussed in more detail in the pages that follow. We conclude this report with a list of recommendations.

Overall, there appears to be a consensus among students, staff and faculty that while Middlebury culture does affirm the broad, basic idea that academic integrity is important and cheating is wrong, the reality of daily practice suggests that the Honor Code has ceased to be a meaningful element of learning and living at Middlebury for most students. Specifically,

1. Students are regularly violating the Honor Code. In the past three *Zeitgeist* surveys completed by the *The Middlebury Campus* (2022–2024), over 60% of students self-reported that they have violated the Honor Code (up from 35% in the 2019 survey).

2. The moral obligation to report another for cheating, which is included in our current Honor Code, is generally understood to be unrealistic. The general sentiment emerged that while the ethical commitment to report a violation of the Honor Code represents an ideal of community behavior, the reality is that when a person reports another for an Honor Code violation it makes life very difficult for the reporter given the complex and demanding judicial process that the reporter must, then, engage. The decision to violate the Honor Code was understood to be an individual decision and not one that is the responsibility of other students to oversee.

3. There is broad confusion surrounding the process of adjudicating Honor Code violations.

- **a.** Students stated that professors are not always clear regarding what cheating means in a given class or for a given assignment;
- **b.** Students are not clear regarding how serious faculty are about responding to specific incidents of cheating;
- c. More and more faculty are choosing to avoid the formal judicial process because it is perceived to be lengthy, time-consuming, and having an uncertain outcome;
- **d.** The majority of students, staff and faculty are confused regarding what consequences might follow from a student being caught cheating;
- **e.** The majority of students, staff and faculty are confused regarding whether consequences are consistently and equally applied and who would mete out consequences if a student was ‘caught.’

4. Given the conditions created by numbers 1-3 above, faculty are generally frustrated by the inability to proctor exams. Once again, students, staff, and faculty understood the ideal of a student body that was both self-monitoring and self-reporting regarding violations of the Honor Code. However, students and faculty report that this self-monitoring and reporting is simply not happening. As a result,

faculty are frustrated and asking for the right to proctor exams. As we discuss below, this would represent a fundamental change in the language and meaning of the current Honor Code.

5. Generative Artificial Intelligence represents a new order of complexity for defining and identifying the uses of "authorized" and "unauthorized" assistance on a given assignment. AI use has spread rapidly at Middlebury, and the number of students self-reporting breaking the honor code through unauthorized use of AI is increasing. As the number of available AI tools and the ways in which students are using them continue to expand rapidly, it is important to provide clarity about when the use of AI is consistent with academic integrity and when it is not.

Discussion of the Five Themes: Fostering a Culture of Academic Integrity at Middlebury

The committee learned that most members of the college community do not believe that we have a shared understanding regarding what it means to embody a culture of academic integrity at Middlebury. While the pandemic profoundly disrupted previous norms and routines regarding late work, deadlines and extensions, the general consensus appears to be that the lack of a shared understanding preceded the pandemic. The disruption of the pandemic and our return to in-person classes simply made more evident the lack of a shared and explicit understanding of the meaning and importance of academic integrity.

1. The Prevalence of Violations

The *Campus* survey results match the general perception expressed by both faculty and students that students are making decisions regarding whether to cheat or not based on any number of factors including, but not limited to:

a. The pressure to get an "A". This pressure may be coming from the student's self perception that they are an "A" student and anything less represents a failure, or explicit family expectations, or other sources;
b. A Middlebury degree is a credential and while integrity may matter, the "A" matters more for future prospects such as graduate school or the right internship or a future employer;
c. Genuine confusion regarding a professor's expectations about what is or is not "unauthorized assistance;"
d. Ease of cheating in a context with smartphones, AI, and unproctored exams;
e. Others are cheating and not getting caught–I can't risk not competing with them; and
f. Poor planning on the part of a student which leads to a late-night decision to choose to cheat in order to finish an assignment on time rather than risk a lower grade.

2. The Moral Obligation to Report

Under the heading of "Community Accountability" our current Handbook Language states,

> Academic integrity is the foundation of a healthy intellectual community. One individual's intellectual dishonesty erodes that foundation and negatively affects all community members. Therefore, in addition to adhering to the Academic Honesty Policy themselves, the student-written Constitution of the Undergraduate Honor Code states that "Any member of the College community (student, faculty, or administrator) who is aware of a case of academic dishonesty is morally obligated to report it to the professor or the judicial affairs officer."

Yet, at the first open meeting for faculty, colleagues pointed out that students do not report violations of the Honor Code and that the entire honor system is weakened when one component is consistently not upheld. As one person put it, "It's a weird situation where a lot of kids who aren't cheating are also technically in violation because there's a culture of not snitching, and when everyone feels like they've already violated the code just by staying quiet, violating it in other worse ways (i.e. copying someones test or faking the data in your lab report) feels like a smaller step than it otherwise would."

Almost all subsequent sources of information (later conversations with faculty, the current and previous judicial affairs officer, the student survey, and the SGA-sponsored conversation) reinforced the view that students do not and will not report violations. Professor of Economics Jessica Holmes provided data from a student-conducted survey in 2008 in which the reasons given by students for not reporting violations included "never witnessed", "not my business", "It's not a big deal", "a lot of students are cheating, why single anyone out", "it's their problem", "it's not fair to those who aren't cheating", and "I have done it". Associate Dean for Community Standards, Brian Lind, confirmed that the judicial process that is initiated when students report a violation is perceived to be prohibitively onerous to many students.

There is some complicating evidence: one student indicated a willingness to confront a cheater, and the minutes from the SGA-sponsored meeting note that there is not a clear consensus among students about eliminating the moral obligation to report. This finding is difficult to reconcile with all the other information we received, including that from the student survey. Nonetheless, the general tenor of the input we received led us to the position that having an unobserved and unenforced component weakens the honor system as a whole.

3. The Judicial Process

Further complicating the ingredients necessary for building a culture of academic integrity is the divergence between the explicit, written procedures for violations and the reality of daily practice. For example, Article III of the Constitution of the Undergraduate Honor System explains the process for adjudicating violations of the Honor Code:

> *Article III: Violations of the Honor Code, Procedures, and Disciplinary Actions*
> a. Any member of the College community (student, faculty, or administrator) who is aware of a case of academic dishonesty is morally obligated to report it to the professor or the judicial affairs officer.
> b. Those who cheat are morally obliged to report their own offense to the professor or the judicial affairs officer.
> c. Alleged violations will be handled according to the academic disciplinary policies of the current Middlebury College Handbook.
> d. For cases that are heard by the Academic Judicial Board, if seven members of the Board are present, six votes are needed for a decision of guilt. If six members are present, five votes are needed.
> e. Any infraction of the honor system is normally punishable by suspension from the College. However, the penalty may be modified when, in the opinion of the Academic Judicial Board, conclusive reasons warrant such action.
> f. Should the accused be found not guilty, all records of the proceeding will be destroyed.
> g. Right of Appeal: A student found guilty of an offense will have the right of appeal to the Judicial Appeals Board in all cases.
> h. All deliberations of the Academic Judicial Board concerning violations of the honor system will be conducted in confidence.

As we have discussed above, students rarely report violations of others and even more rarely do they report their own violations rendering points (a) and (b) moot. In addition, we learned that more and more faculty members are choosing to avoid the formal judicial process because (i) the formal process is very lengthy and (ii) the outcome is never certain. Several professors noted instances in which they believed they had clear evidence of student cheating, reported those instances formally, but after several months of working through the formal process, the student was found not guilty. These professors noted that the formal process is exhausting and time consuming as well as demoralizing when students are found not guilty. Hence, more professors are choosing to handle violations within their own courses, expediting the process for them and giving them control over the outcome. Yet, the committee recognizes that when professors adjudicate Honor Code violations themselves, there is no oversight and less consistency, and no formal record is retained of such events. As a result of the absence of any records, the possibility of identifying a pattern of behavior is not possible.

Another area of concern is that the high level of reported cheating, yet low level of formally adjudicated cases, creates ethical dilemmas for colleagues who administer pre professional programs; they

often know about violations of the Honor Code, but cannot share them to outside entities who are interested in the ethical behavior of their applicants. Medical schools require disclosure of any "institutional action" for academic or conduct violations, but since only probation and suspension become part of a student's permanent record, applicants can get away with not disclosing anything that results in a lesser penalty. When a faculty member handles Honor Code violations within their own classroom it decreases the likelihood that violations will be reported. A single professor's discipline is not "institutional action" under the guidelines. The Health Professions Office, for example, has recently changed its policy and refers medical school admissions officers to the Office for Community Standards when it comes to signing off on whether students have committed violations. We also heard that the pre-engineering program, where students complete their degrees with work at Columbia or Dartmouth, is in an analogous situation and is still looking for a solution.

In addition, regarding policies (c) and (e) of Article III listed above, the Handbook does not have a separate section on "academic disciplinary policies". Information is limited and interspersed with conduct violations (Sections B.2.d and B.2.e). The most relevant is B.2.d.VII.c, which says:

> Plagiarism, cheating, or any other violation of the Undergraduate Honor System is normally punishable by suspension. In 1997, the faculty reaffirmed its commitment to suspension as the normal outcome for violations of the standards of academic integrity. Students found guilty of academic dishonesty will normally fail the course in which the offense occurred. On rare occasions, if compelling reasons exist for not suspending a student found guilty of academic dishonesty, the sanctioning authority may issue no less than a reprimand and invoke either of the following penalties: a 0 or an F on the piece of work, or a 0 or an F in the course.

In recent years, penalties other than suspension have become the rule and, suspension, the exception (The Associate Dean for Community Standards handles 40-50 cases per year, but only 2-3 go to the Judicial Board). The increased prevalence of lighter penalties arises from effort to address each case individually and maintain the twin goals of equity and fairness. Brian Lind posed several hypothetical scenarios: Should a single act of plagiarism by a first-year student, who may not have understood the professor's expectations, be treated in the same manner as a senior committing the same act in a Senior Thesis? Is there an opportunity to educate rather than punish a first year student? What if we know that a student suspended for a semester may be sent home to a situation that is profoundly unsafe for them? Do we simply apply our policy without concern for their safety? As the student body of Middlebury has become more diverse so the impact of our policies have an increasingly diverse impact. Not all students, for example, have a room of their own to go home to.

Students expressed frustration in what they believe to be a judicial process that is administered unevenly. Given that the process is confidential, specifics and nuance do not make it out to the public domain. In general, students assume penalties are “harsh”, which was another stated reason why they do not report on each other; but they also expressed uncertainty regarding the process itself. When we combine the fact that more faculty may be handling infractions on their own and that a commitment to equity may, in fact, lead to different outcomes, student confusion surrounding outcomes is understandable. Finally, faculty, in multiple sessions, expressed confusion, frustration, and bewilderment regarding the fact that formal academic violations of the Honor Code are handled by the Student Affairs Division rather than the Academic Affairs Division. Many faculty believe that violations being adjudicated through Student Affairs contributed to the feeling that the process is opaque and uneven despite the time invested by those involved to attend to each student's case with care and attention. Finally, the process as currently organized burdens a single judicial affairs officer with upholding and administering the honor system for the college.

4. Proctoring

Article II (“Examination Procedure”) of section C of the “Undergraduate Honor System” currently stipulates the following:

> a. Only authorized materials may be used during an examination.
> b. No proctors will be present during examinations, unless specific authorization has been given by the dean of the College.
> c. The dean of the College may grant an instructor permission to proctor an examination in his or her course when the instructor has communicated to the dean of the College that she or he has a concern that students will cheat in examinations in the course. Authorization will apply to the remainder of the semester.
>
> > i) Communication of concern may take the form of an e-mail to the dean of the College.
> > ii) Instructors who have concerns about cheating and wish to proctor must make a formal announcement to the class both in class and in e-mail form at least 24 hours prior to the examination. The dean of the College must be copied on the announcement email.
> > iii) Students may register complaints or concerns about the method of proctoring with the dean of the College.
>
> d. When an instructor's presence in the exam is required because of the nature of the exam (e.g., slides), the instructor should receive permission from the dean of the College and notify the class in advance.
> e. The instructor will remain in the examination room for no more than 15 minutes after the start of an examination. He or she may return during the examination to check on any further problems that students may have with examination questions or general procedure, only if he or she announces his or her intention to do so at the beginning of the examination. Instructors will remain in the general area for questions for the duration of the examination period.
> f. During the examination each student will have complete freedom of action providing he or she does not interfere with the work of others. Except in the case of take-home examinations, no examination papers will be taken from the room except to consult with the instructor.

The general consensus among faculty was that the language of the Honor Code should be revised to allow any faculty member to proctor exams at his/her/their own discretion, without having to seek special permission. Faculty viewed proctoring as a recognition of the present reality of cheating that needs to be addressed and a public commitment to the idea that academic integrity matters. Faculty who want to proctor exams are currently uncertain who to ask for authorization since there is no longer a Dean of the College. Some faculty have asked and been granted permission by the Dean of the Faculty instead. One faculty member wrote,

> "The proctoring of exams should be at faculty discretion. Last semester, I requested permission from Dean of the Faculty, Jim Ralph, to do so. I did so again this semester and will continue to do so for all 100- and 200-level courses, at a minimum. Nearly every semester in the past, I found myself with academic dishonesty cases that often involved a large amount of my time and a large amount of emotional upheaval for students, not necessarily only the accused. With the introduction of proctoring, the ability to violate the Honor Code is nearly eliminated, my time is better utilized, and student upset is greatly diminished. I deeply regret not having proctored all my exams in the past."

Faculty proposed that proctoring follow a guiding ethos of "trust, but verify." It seems important to establish a set of guidelines for proctoring (similar to the current guidelines for administering unproctored exams) to avoid intrusive proctoring practices such as eye tracking technology. It is also a legal requirement to ensure that any proctoring is implemented in an equivalent manner for students with ADA accommodations. Faculty who are currently proctoring exams have found it challenging to consistently proctor the large number of students with accommodations (particularly those needing double-time on exams and/or a distraction-reduced space). The current testing space provided for students with accommodations in the Proctor basement is unproctored.

Students' opinions about proctoring were more varied, with some calling for a universal implementation of proctoring, some not wanting it at all, and the majority falling somewhere in the middle, understanding proctoring as an unpleasant, but necessary solution in the present environment. Students supporting proctoring were primarily concerned about current levels of cheating. In the words of one student,

> "I think there should be more proctoring of exams. I even think mandatory proctored final exams or midterms should be college wide. Specifically in STEM classes, the amount of blatant cheating, going to the bathroom to use phones, etc. is disheartening. It also puts students who do not want to cheat at a potential disadvantage in terms of grades."

Students opposed to proctoring were concerned that proctoring would further break down trust between faculty and students and lead to an increase in testing anxiety. In the words of one student,

> "Employing the honor code within an exam is supposed to build trust. Having a proctor takes away that trust -- that professors/faculty do not trust their students. Exam proctors also introduce an increased level of stress and anxiety for students."

Another student wrote, "I feel like if they want to sit in the room with the students that's fine, just as long as they're not walking around looking over students' shoulders."

While some students recognized the need for different policies in different situations, many expressed the desire for some consistency of proctoring practices, e.g. across different sections of the same course or at the department or division level. Students also hoped that once the Honor Code is taken more seriously, the culture would shift and proctoring would no longer be necessary. In the words of one student, "Having universally non-proctored exams with no cheating at Middlebury is an optimistic goal for the Honor Code. Before we can achieve this, the Honor Code must work sufficiently in other areas."

Taking both faculty and student opinions into account, a shift towards allowing faculty to proctor at their own discretion seems warranted. However, to the extent possible, proctoring should be implemented in a manner that affirms both faculty and students' commitment to academic integrity and reduces (rather than increases) student stress and anxiety (for instance, by enabling them to concentrate on their own work rather than policing others).

5. Artificial Intelligence

The number of AI tools available and their potential applications are increasing rapidly. Both faculty and students perceive that the use of AI among students is widespread. One student writes, "It is a new technology that is becoming dramatically more common and influential in students' lives. There's no removing it as a resource at this point, so there has to be some other form of regulation to avoid the abuse of it."

ChatGPT – the most well-known and widely-used AI tool – was launched in November 2022. By the time of the spring 2023 Zeitgeist survey by the *Middlebury Campus*, 15% of Middlebury students self-reported breaking the Honor Code through unauthorized use of AI. By the time of the spring 2024 Zeitgeist survey, that number had nearly doubled to 29%.

Faculty expressed that students have some confusion about what exactly constitutes "cheating" or an Honor Code violation when AI is involved. Students know that it is wrong to steal ideas from someone else without citation, but they often don't hesitate to use AI, which often essentially involves the same thing. However, it is not always obvious where to draw the line, e.g. using AI to improve the grammar in

a draft paper or to find/collect sources more quickly than using a search engine. It is also not always clear what is or is not AI, especially as AI is increasingly integrated into other software like web browsers.

One important distinction that emerged from discussions with students is AI use for “input” vs. AI use for “output.” Many students are using AI more for “input” – helping them find and organize information, take notes, break down material, create study guides, etc. They are concerned that strict no-AI policies make this “input” use an honor code violation, when the intention from the faculty side is actually to prohibit AI use for “output.” At the same time, they recognize that AI is also being used for “output” by other students. One student, responding in the student survey, wrote, “There are good ways to use it and bad ways to use it. I don't support banning it altogether. But we have to do something, because so many students are using it to cheat.”

In a world where all students have access to smartphones and AI, many students, staff, and faculty suggested that cultivating a positive practice of academic integrity may be more important than a negative focus on policing cheating (which is more and more difficult to do). The use of AI is often difficult or impossible to detect, and even if faculty suspect that an assignment was written by AI it can be difficult or impossible to prove. Existing AI detection software has been shown to be unreliable and biased (e.g. against non-native English speakers). Detection is likely to become even more difficult as the number of AI tools continues to increase and their capabilities continue to improve. Students are aware of this and sometimes interpret faculty AI policies as “suggestions” because they don’t think they can be enforced. Some students report being more likely to use AI on lower-stakes assignments (e.g. problem sets graded by student TA graders) vs. higher-stakes assignments where they know the professor will be reading the assignment closely. Students suggest (and some faculty report) changing assignments to make them more difficult to answer using AI (e.g. writing assignments based on class-specific materials or discussions) and prioritizing in-person exams rather than take-home exams.

Students appreciate those faculty who are teaching them about how to use or not use AI, and some note that jobs/internships are already expecting them to know how to use AI. However, most faculty seem to be less knowledgeable / experienced with AI tools than students, and it seems unrealistic (at least at this stage) to expect all faculty to be able to teach students about AI use given the relentless pace of innovation that is likely to continue.

Faculty members appear to hold two views on AI and the Honor Code:

1. One faculty member stated, “AI software like ChatGPT is essentially a plagiarism machine,” and suggested that the Honor Code ban the use of AI explicitly unless authorized by the instructor. This professor further argued that, “The point of classwork is for students to learn to do things themselves -- all the problems I assign have already been solved, but it is nonetheless valuable for students to learn how to solve them on their own.”
2. Another faculty member wrote, “AI is likely to evolve in many ways that we cannot right now imagine.” As a result, this professor argued that the Honor Code should not mention AI because we cannot keep up with the pace of technological innovation nor the many ways that faculty members might want to use it in their courses. From this perspective, the Honor Code should continue to leave it up to faculty to define what is “authorized” or “unauthorized” aid in the context of their class. This flexibility allows individual faculty to approach AI differently and to change that approach as the technology evolves.

Some faculty have started asking students to cite/explain any use of AI on their submitted assignments (many academic journals have adopted a similar policy). However, faculty noted that students rarely/never actually do cite/explain their use of AI. Students expressed that they are worried that if they admit to using AI for help on the assignment then faculty will think that they used it more than they actually did (e.g. for writing the assignment rather than for just identifying outside sources). A number of students and faculty suggested that it might be helpful if there were a standard/consistent way to cite AI and how it was used.

Committee Recommendations

1. Publicly and regularly define and affirm the meaning and importance of academic integrity. The goal of such an approach is to introduce academic integrity and honesty not as something punishable if not followed, but, rather, as the affirmation of a desirable goal to embody as a learner and as a human being. We have an Honor Code because we want to explicitly affirm values that we care about and that we hope to embody for the rest of our lives in personal and professional relationships. Students should be introduced to the concept and meaning of academic integrity at Middlebury as early as possible, and professors should clarify, *in each semester and in every course*, the importance of academic integrity, what it means, and why it matters. We also recommend that,

   a. The Honor Code signing ceremony should be reinstated during Orientation. Both students and faculty felt that this is a helpful way of affirming up front that academic integrity matters to our community. This ceremony could be incorporated at the close of

Convocation (which is now being held at the beginning of Orientation rather than at the end) or immediately following the first meeting of the First Year Seminar during Orientation.

b. Professors should make clear what "authorized use" means for each assignment in their course. Such statements will vary from course to course, which is to be expected, and is a normal part of life at a Liberal Arts College.
c. The Academic Integrity Committee should serve as a place for faculty to explore best practices surrounding academic integrity within their courses and as a reference point for resources and continued discussion of academic integrity.

2. *Remove the moral obligation for students to report*. There was a majority sense, but not a unanimous one, that the obligation to report another student for unauthorized assistance is not realistic, causes undue burden on the reporter and, therefore, should not be part of future statements and policies regarding how we develop a culture of academic integrity at Middlebury.

3. Clarify the process of adjudicating Honor Code violations. While the understanding of what constitutes "authorized" assistance will necessarily vary from course to course, the process for adjudicating violations should not. We recommend that,

a. The process of adjudicating Honor Code violations as well as the consequences should be updated and clarified; specifically there should be a table of violations and concomitant penalties, as well as the circumstances and factors that inform decision making.
b. In addition to consequences, every opportunity should be taken to use student violations as 'teaching moments' rather than simply as a way to mete out punishments to demonstrate a serious commitment to academic integrity.
c. Faculty should be encouraged to recommit to the honor system. This should be done both by addressing some of the factors (time, unpredictability) that have discouraged their involvement as well as through regular and higher-profile reminders of procedures and online resources.
d. The option of moving the adjudication process to the Academic Affairs Division (e.g. Office of the Dean of Faculty) rather than the Student Affairs Division (Community Standards) should be explored.

4. Allow the proctoring of exams at faculty discretion and in accordance with ADA requirements. As discussed above, students and faculty agreed that while frustrating, proctoring exams would likely contribute to a decrease in cheating. Given the way the current Honor Code is written, this would require

fundamental change to the Constitution of the Undergraduate Honor System. If this change is implemented, we also recommend that,

a. guidelines for proctored exams should be formulated to prevent excessive monitoring of students in ways that increase anxiety and erode trust;
b. a proctored testing center should be established where students with ADA accommodations, student athletes, students with Dean-approved final exam changes, etc. can take proctored exams without faculty being present. ADA requirements mean that student accommodations can be varied and complex in any single course, making it nearly impossible for a single professor to proctor all the variations that may be necessary. Most other institutions of higher education maintain a testing center, and Middlebury can learn from them.

5. *Clarify when the use of AI is or is not consistent with academic integrity and imagine different forms of assessment.* The authorization/prohibition of AI use should continue to be up to the instructor's discretion as part of their definition of authorized/unauthorized aid for specific courses or assignments. However, we recommend that:

a. Minor revisions should be made to Honor Code language to make it clear that representing AI output as one's own work without citation / quotation is plagiarism, violating the honor code;
b. Clear examples should be developed for reference (available online and included in the academic integrity tutorial) of when AI use crosses the threshold of plagiarism.
c. Given the complexity and inconsistency of identifying AI-generated content, colleagues with expertise in educational software should continue to monitor developments regarding detection software and advise faculty and Community Standards on its appropriate use.
d. Further faculty discussion should be facilitated (perhaps by colleagues in the CTLR) around imagining new ways of designing genuine assessments that might provide different ways for students to demonstrate their learning that would make cheating or plagiarism much more obvious and much less helpful.

Conclusion

This report is the end of the first stage of the Committee's work. Next year (2024-2025) we intend to move towards implementing the recommendations. We foresee bringing this report to the faculty for the Bread Loaf meeting, gathering further feedback from faculty, students and staff, drafting the final language to be voted on, referring the language to the faculty, and collaborating with the SGA to organize the student vote required to revise the Honor Code.